

1 Douglas Q. Hahn (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 dhahn@stradlinglaw.com
3 Salil Bali (admitted *pro hac vice*)
4 sbali@stradlinglaw.com
5 STRADLING YOCOA CARLSON & RAUTH LLP
6 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1600
7 Newport Beach, CA 92660
8 Tel: (949) 725-4000
9
10 Ogonna M. Brown, Esq., NV Bar No. 7589
11 Ogonna.Brown@wbd-us.com
12 Meng Zhong, Esq., NV Bar No. 12145
13 Meng.Zhong@wbd-us.com
14 WOMBLE BOND DICKINSON LLP
15 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600
16 Las Vegas, NV 89169
17 Tel: (702) 949-8200

18
19 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs The Spearmint Rhino
Companies Worldwide, Inc. and K-Kel, Inc.*

20
21 Marc J. Randazza, NV Bar No. 12265
22 Trey A. Rothell, NV Bar No. 15993
23 RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC
24 4974 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 100
25 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
26 Telephone: 702-420-2001
27 ecf@randazza.com

28
29 Maxwell Goss (*pro hac vice*)
30 MAXWELL GOSS PLLC
31 2701 Cambridge Court, Suite 100
32 Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326
33 Telephone: (248) 266-5879
34 max@maxwellgoss.com

35
36 *Attorneys for Defendants
37 Chang's Dynasty LLC and Alan Chang*

38
39
40 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
41
42 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

43
44 The Spearmint Rhino Companies Worldwide,
45 Inc. and K-Kel, Inc.,

46
47 Plaintiffs,

48
49 vs.

50
51 Chang's Dynasty LLC and Alan Chang,

52
53 Defendants.

54 Civil Action No. 2:23-cv-02040-ART-BNW

55 Honorable Anne R. Traum
56 Magistrate Judge Brenda Weksler

57
58 **JOINT STIPULATION AND
59 [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND
60 DISCOVERY**

61
62 **(FOURTH REQUEST)**

1 Plaintiffs The Spearmint Rhino Companies Worldwide, Inc. and K-Kel, Inc.
 2 (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendants Chang’s Dynasty LLC and Alan Chang (“Defendants”)
 3 (collectively, “the Parties”) hereby stipulate as follows pursuant to FRCP 26, LR IA 6-1 and LR
 4 26-3:

5 **I. COMPLETED DISCOVERY**

6 The Parties have engaged in considerable discovery, with Plaintiffs and Defendants
 7 having served multiple sets of interrogatories, requests for production, and requests for
 8 admission. The exchanged written discovery has been completed and the parties have agreed
 9 not to serve any further written discovery. The parties have also exchanged documents and
 10 completed seven depositions to date.

11 **II. REMAINING DISCOVERY**

12 A number of depositions of knowledgeable parties’ witnesses, prior employees and
 13 organization designees (30(b)(6) witnesses) remain to be taken. These depositions have not
 14 been completed, in part due to witness health concerns for one key witness and the availability
 15 of other witnesses and counsel. For the remaining depositions, to save time and expense,
 16 counsel have agreed to conduct all depositions in either Las Vegas or Newport Beach (or
 17 otherwise via remote means) and to schedule depositions together to reduce the number of trips
 18 needed. However, this approach has proven to require more advance planning and coordination,
 19 especially as counsel have learned that certain witnesses were previously committed,
 20 unavailable, or traveling. In addition, some attorneys were sick for some time during the prior
 21 extension period, which further complicated these depositions and caused delays.

22 **III. PROPOSED EXTENSION**

23 The parties believe that they can complete the remaining discovery with the adjustments
 24 to the existing schedule set forth below.

	Current Deadline	New Deadline
Close of Fact Discovery	January 31, 2025	March 28, 2025

1	F.R.C.P. 26(a)(2) Disclosures	February 28, 2025	April 22, 2025
2	Disclosure of Rebuttal Experts	March 28, 2025	May 16, 2025
3	Expert Discovery Closes	April 25, 2025	May 30, 2025
4	Dispositive Motions	May 23, 2025	June 20, 2025
5	Pretrial Order	June 20, 2025	July 18, 2025

8 **IV. THERE IS GOOD CAUSE TO EXTEND THE DISCOVERY DEADLINE**

9 While the parties recognize that the last extension was intended to be a final extension,
10 the parties have engaged diligently to work together on the remaining discovery. However, the
11 circumstances outlined above have made it necessary to seek additional accommodation from
12 the Court.

13 The good cause inquiry is focused on the movant's reasons for seeking to modify the
14 scheduling order and primarily considers the movant's diligence. *In re W. States Wholesale*
15 *Nat. Gas Antitrust Litig.*, 715 F.3d 716, 737 (9th Cir. 2013). The key determination is whether
16 the subject deadline "cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the
17 extension." *Desio v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 339 F.R.D. 632, 638 (D. Nev. 2021). The
18 Court considers whether relief from the scheduling order is sought based on the development
19 of matters that could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time the schedule was
20 established. *Id.*; *Jackson v. Laureate, Inc.*, 186 F.R.D. 605, 608 (E.D. Cal. 1999). Courts may
21 also consider other pertinent circumstances, including whether the movant was diligent in
22 seeking modification of the scheduling order once it became apparent that the movant required
23 relief from the deadline at issue. *Id.*; *Sharp v. Covenant Care LLC*, 288 F.R.D. 465, 467 (S.D.
24 Cal. 2012). "The diligence obligation is ongoing" such that parties must "diligently attempt to
25 adhere to [the deadlines in the scheduling order] throughout the subsequent course of the
26 litigation." *Id.* quoting *Morgal v. Maricopa Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors*, 284 F.R.D. 452, 460 (D.
27 Ariz. 2012). The showing of diligence is measured by the conduct displayed throughout the
28

1 entire period of time already allowed. *Williams v. James River Grp. Inc.*, No.
 2 222CV00186RFBNK, 2022 WL 4181415, at *3 (D. Nev. Sept. 13, 2022). The party seeking
 3 modification of the scheduling order bears the burden of establishing diligence. *Singer v. Las
 4 Vegas Athletic Clubs*, 376 F. Supp. 3d 1062, 1077 (D. Nev. 2019).

5 Here, both parties have been working diligently to undertake discovery in good faith
 6 and avoid unnecessary motion practice. As recently as January 13-17, 2025, the parties were
 7 in Las Vegas taking depositions and conducting site inspections. During that time counsel for
 8 Plaintiffs and Defendants discussed the remaining depositions and the feasibility of completing
 9 them before the upcoming deadline. The parties met and conferred last week, consulted with
 10 respective local counsel, and now immediately bring this motion.

11 Courts have found good cause where there has been a development of unforeseen
 12 matters and scheduling difficulties. *United States v. Tucker*, No. 221CV02049JCMNJK, 2022
 13 WL 5264371, at *1 (D. Nev. Aug. 31, 2022) (finding good cause for an extension where
 14 scheduling difficulties have led to the inability to take the deposition during the current
 15 discovery period); *Castronovo-Flihan v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, No.
 16 220CV01197JCMDJA, 2021 WL 5413886, at *2 (D. Nev. Sept. 17, 2021) (finding good cause
 17 to extend the discovery deadlines where defendant was diligent in requesting Plaintiff's
 18 cooperation to attend for in-person examinations but did not receive responses); *Green v. City
 19 of Phoenix*, 330 F.R.D. 239 (D. Ariz. 2019) (finding good cause existed to modify the
 20 discovery deadline where deponent was scheduled for surgery and party was unable to
 21 anticipate officer's unavailability for trial prior to the close of discovery). The parties agreed to
 22 an ambitious discovery schedule and have worked diligently and cooperatively to complete
 23 discovery by the current discovery deadline. However, unexpected events have prevented the
 24 parties from doing so and thus necessitated this request for a modest amount of additional time.

25

26

27

28

1 For these reasons, the parties have conferred and respectfully request the foregoing
2 extension to the case schedule.

3

4 Dated: January 29, 2025

STRADLING YOCOA CARLSON & RAUTH LLP

5

By: /s/ Douglas Q. Hahn

6

Douglas Q. Hahn (admitted *pro hac vice*)

7

WOMBLE BOND DICKINSON (US) LLP

8

Meng Zhong, Esq.

9

Ogonna M. Brown, Esq.

10

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs The Spearmint Rhino
Companies Worldwide, Inc. and K-Kel, Inc.*

11

MAXWELL GOSS PLLC

12

By: /s/ Maxwell Goss

13

Maxwell Goss

14

Elizabeth Erickson

15

RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP

16

Marc J. Randazza

17

Trey A. Rothell

18

Attorneys for Defendants

19

Chang's Dynasty LLC and Alan Chang

20

IT IS SO ORDERED

21

22

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

23

24

DATED: _____

25

26

27

28